



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/519,242	03/06/2000	Carl Herman Haken	CH2000A	8274

7590

08/12/2003

Carl Haken  
5 Old Neversink Road  
Danbury, CT 06811

EXAMINER

TRAN, MYLINH T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2174

DATE MAILED: 08/12/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/519,242

Applicant(s)

HAKEN, CARL HERMAN

Examiner

Mylinh T Tran

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Amendment filed 05/2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Applicant's Amendment filed 05/20/03 has been entered and carefully considered. However, limitations of amended claims have not been found to be patentable over prior art of record. Claims 1-14 are rejected under the new ground of rejection as set forth below.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimizu et al. [US. 6,219,027] in view of Ahern et al. [US. 6,388,658].

As to claims 1, 13 and 14, Shimizu et al. discloses a first processor which functions to generate a first image of a first graphical desktop user interface and a first display screen connected to the first processor to display the first image (see abstract, figure 9 (D1) and column 5, lines 19-43); a first pointing device connected to the first processor to control movement of a first cursor in the first image (column 6, lines 52-62); second visual display means and which are movable in relation to the first display screen (figure 9, (D1, D2), column 5, line

Art Unit: 2174

62 through column 6, line 8); means which determine a first relative direction, from the first display screen to the second visual display means (column 7, lines 9-52 and column 8, lines 20-40) and program means which expand the display of graphical desktop user interface onto the second visual display means at times and the second visual display means are also in the vicinity the first display screen so that movement of the first pointing device in the first relative direction causes the first cursor to move to and (to appear to disappear off of an edge of first display screen )and further causes the appearance of a new visual indication on the second visual display means (column 2, line 56 through column 3, line 15 and column 9, lines 10-50). The differences between Shimizu et al. and the claim is a second processor with the second display to move in relation to the first display screen and means for communicating signals between the first processor and the second processor means. Ahern et al. shows multiple computers with plural displays means (see abstract and column 5, lines 50-63 and column 7, lines 52-60) and means for communicating signals at figure 1A, column 5, lines 50-63 and column 7, lines 52-60. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Shimizu et al. and Ahern et al. before them at the time the invention was made to modify the concept of movement the pointing device between two different displays shape taught by Shimizu et al. to include the multiple processors with displays of Ahern et al., in order to provide users an image display system in which a

Art Unit: 2174

user can control information display on multiple display devices with a single pointing device as taught by Ahern et al.

As to claim 2, while Ahern et al. shows multiple computer processors with plurality of display, Shimizu et al. teaches movement of the first pointing device in the first relative direction causes the first cursor to move to and disappear off an edge of the first display screen in a direction toward the second visual display means and to apparently seamlessly appear as a new cursor on the second display screen (column 7, lines 9-59 and column 8, lines 3-53).

As to claim 3, Shimizu et al. also shows the new cursor appears at an edge of the second display screen that is oriented toward the first display screen (column 19-43).

As to claim 4, Shimizu et al. teaches the first pointing device further functions to control movement of the new cursor on the second display screen (column 6, line 53 through column 7, line 17).

As to claim 5, Shimizu et al. also teaches the first cursor to reappear on the first display screen whenever the new cursor is moved off the edge of the second display screen in a direction toward the first display screen (column 8, lines 33-53).

As to claim 6, Shimizu et al. demonstrates the first pointing device controls the appearance and apparent movement of the new visual indication on the second visual display means (column 10, lines 40-53).

As to claims 7 and 8, Shimizu et al. also demonstrates communicating is a docking cradle attached at an edge of the first display screen for supporting the second processor means and the means which determine comprise means which sense that the second processor means are in the cradle (column 9, line 60 through column 10, line 10).

As to claim 9, Ahern et al. discloses the means for communicating are a wireless interface and wherein the means, which determine comprise a directional antenna array (column 1, lines 34-60). Ahern shows transmitting and receiving signals in a wireless interface (because transmitting and receiving signal without wire).

As to claim 10, Ahern et al. also discloses the means which communicate are an infrared light interface and the means which determine are directional infrared sensors (column 6, lines 50-62, column 7, lines 3-8 and column 8, lines 5-20). Signals when transmitted and received when moving the cursor between two displays. Therefore, the infrared light and directional sensor are included.

As to claim 11, Ahern et al. shows the second visual display means comprise one or more indicator lights (column 2, lines 52-67).

As to claim 12, Ahern et al. teaches the second processor means is a device selected from the group consisting of: personal data assistants, laptop computers, digital cameras, audio players, video games, cordless telephones, cellular telephones, television receivers, VCR's and scanners (video, column 2, lines 53-65 and column 4, lines 20-35).

**Response to Arguments**

Regarding claims 1, 13 and 14, Applicant has argued Shimizu does not describe "suggests means for determining the relative physical direction between his two display screens or for using information regarding the relative direction to control appearance and disappearance of the cursor and/or visual indications". However, the Examiner does not agree. Applicant's attention is directed to column 8, lines 20-40, "since the ratio between the pixel pitch on the display device D1 and the pixel pitch on the display device D2 is 2:1, the cursor display position moves regularly across the display devices D1 and D2" and "there are other approaches for determining and converting the cursor movement. For example, when the mouse cursor is displayed on the display device D1, outputs from the mouse could be processed in steps of 2, and when the mouse cursor is displayed on the display device D2, outputs from the mouse could process in steps of 1". Because the ratio between the pixel pitch of first display and second display is different, the system of Shimizu et al. describes determining the direction for moving from the first to the second display.

Regarding claims 7 and 8, Applicant has argued there is no "docking cradle attached to an edge of a display screen and means which sense that the second processor is in the cradle" in Shimizu system. However, the cited portion at column 9, line 61 through column 10, line 5 supports the feature.

Art Unit: 2174

Figure 13, first display (D11) is right next to the second display D12 which supports together by attaching the first display and the second one.

Claims 9-12 are moot in view of the new ground of rejection



Art Unit: 2174

### **Conclusion**

Responses to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231. If applicant desires fax a response, (703) 746-7238), may be used for formal After Final communications, (703) 746-7239 for Official communications, or (703) 746-74395 for Non-Official or draft communications. NOTE, A Request for Continuation (Rule 60 or 62) cannot be faxed.

Please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT" for information facsimile communications. For after final responses, please label "AFTER FINAL" or "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE" on the document.

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mylinh Tran whose telephone number is (703) 308-1304. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8.00AM to 6.30PM

If attempt to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (703) 308-0640,

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements

of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy *Kristine Kincaid*  
KRISTINE KINCAID  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100